in response to the command, establish the browser and chat regions on the display device, the command including an HTML command.

REMARKS

Applicants submit this Supplemental Amendment to replace entirely the Amendment filed January 28, 1999. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,572,619, issued to Judson, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,916, issued to Busey, et al.

The Examiner acknowledges that Judson does not disclose "that chat region being a real time continuously open bidirectional communications chat region embedded in the browser region", but takes the position that Busey discloses this type of chat region embedded in the browser region. See Paper Number 8, page 3. To support this position, the Examiner cites Busey at column 5, lines 40-47.

Initially, the Applicants point out that the cited Busey '916 patent is not properly prior art against the present application because the Busey '916 patent and the present application have an identical inventive entity. As the

Examiner used the combination of Judson and Busey to reject all of the claims, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow all of the claims.

Furthermore, while no properly cited prior art contains this language, even a prior art reference that contained the language in Busey at column 5 would not make the present invention obvious because while this language in Busey describes in detail the real time continuously open bi-directional communications chat, there is no description of a chat region that is "embedded in the browser region" as claimed by the present invention. None of the prior art teaches a chat region that is *embedded* within the browser region, as recited in claims 10, 28 and 48. In the present invention, the browser region is actually making room for the chat region in a shared real estate scenario so that both browser and chat functions can be occurring in the same region or window (i.e., within the browser region). In other words, the browser region is hosting the chat region within the browser region. Neither Judson nor any of the other cited prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests embedding the chat region within the browser region as recited in independent claims 10, 28 and 48.

Furthermore, neither Judson nor any of the other cited prior art teaches or suggests processing chat content for display in the chat room and processing a document or other content for *concurrent* display in the browser region, as

recited in Claims 13, 31 and 60, as amended. As recited in these dependent claims, the present invention allows the processing and display of both chat content in the chat region and browser content in the browser region at the same time. The Judson reference at column 8, lines 34-36 (relied upon by the Examiner) simply discusses the loading of a web page to a browser and does not discuss the ability to view both chat content and other content simultaneously within the browser region. This claimed function is not suggested or taught in the cited prior art.

Furthermore, neither Judson nor any of the other prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests *linking* the chat region to the browser so that the chat client controls the content displayed in the browser region, as recited in amended Claims 14, 32 and 52. The present invention links the chat region to the browser region using an interface so that the chat client controls the browser content. Thus, at the same time the chat region is being hosted on the browser region, the browser is being controlled by the chat client which is feeding back to the browser region what content should be shown in the browser region. For example, chat could be ongoing in the chat region, while a document or streaming video or other image is being shown in another frame within the browser region. The browser region content is being determined by the chat client. Again, none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests this claimed element.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 10-65.

Applicants do not believe any fees are due with respect to this Supplemental Amendment. However, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0456 of Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH
Attorneys for Applicants

William N. Hulsey III
Reg. No. 33,402

May 3, 1999
100 Congress Avenue
Suite 1440
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 457-7040
(512) 457-7070 (fax)